III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Sayers.

In the amended claims, the interworking unit has been specified to be "a data call interworking function" in order to distinguish it from other interworking functions in the related office systems. From the disclosure (e.g. pages 9-10), it is evident that the main task of the IWF is to adapt the RLP-framed data into a protocol supported by the office system. The data call interworking function has been further specified to be configured to "route the GSM data connections to their destination address in the office network", which is disclosed p. 8, ll. 17-20. Moreover, the data protocol according the mobile system has been defined to be a GSM protocol, as defined in the original claim 6.

The Examiner interprets the terminology of the claims. For example, the Examiner argues that a base station controller is a call control entity, since it controls calls, and a hub is a radio access gateway, since it provides access to a radio network.

However, it is evident that at least the above discussed features are not disclosed in Sayers. Particularly, Sayers does not disclose a BSC operating as a call control entity as claimed in claim 1.

Furthermore, Sayers is silent about the specific features relating to GSM circuit-switched data calls, which requires

totally different technical approach than in GSM voice calls. Even though Sayers mentions GSM circuit-switched data services (col. 6, lines 18-22) as background of the invention, their specific nature is not recognized in any example, which all relate to voice calls.

In the GSM circuit-switched data services, the data transmission chain comprises several network elements, which perform several data transmission rate adaptations to the transmitted data. In the GSM system, data is inserted in RLP frames and then transmitted between a terminal adaptation function TAF in a mobile station and the interworking function IWF of the MSC. The interworking function IWF disassembles data placed in TRAU frames in the GSM system and converts the data transmission rate and the frame structure to suit another telecommunications system, if required.

Accordingly, the operation of the invention requires, in addition to various network elements, which perform data transmission rate adaptations, also detecting the establishment of an internal GSM data connection in the office network. Sayers is silent of detecting any GSM data connection, which proves that Sayers does not even recognize the problem underlying the present invention. Consequently, Sayers discloses no implementation for providing internal GSM data calls in the office system.

Moreover, the passage referred by the Examiner (col. 18, lines 56-60), wherein the gateway translates the IMSI (i.e. subscriber identity) into form readable by a public home location register (HRL), does not disclose a data call interworking function configured to adapt GSM data connections between the office

network and a public land mobile network, as is stated in the amended claim 1.

For all of the above reasons, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-11 under 35 USC 102 on Sayers should be withdrawn. Further, since there is no suggestion of the missing limitations in Sayers, these claims are unobvious over it.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayers.

As previously noted, the prior art itself must suggest a modification; the mere fact that the prior art could be modified is insufficient, see Ex parte Granneman, 68 USPQ2d 1219, 1221. Here there is absolutely no such suggestion. Thus the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC 103 on Sayers should be withdrawn.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayers in view of Gossman.

It is noted that Gossman is not for the problem of avoiding the public network as is the present invention. Thus it cannot be combined with Sayers, see In re Laskowski 10 USPQ2d 1397, 1398-99. Here there is no such common problem. Thus the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should

any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler — Oct 14, 2005

Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to (571) 273-8300 the date indicated below, addressed to the Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: 10/13/05

Signature: _____
Person Making Deposit